(b) Being a Centrally Sponsored Scheme, the releases out of Central allocation were dependent on the State Governments providing 50 per cent of their contribution and also receipt of complete proposals from them, on which adequate response from the States was not received till the end of the financial year.

(c) The Ministry have taken the following steps to improve the situation:

(1) The Ministry convened meetings on 13th and 14th July and 17th August, 2001, with Ministers and Secretaries incharge of Tribal Development of various States wherein, besides other issues, they were also requested to send their proposals under Boys' Hostels scheme in a complete form and that such proposals should include utilization certificates in respect of grants-in-aid released during the previous years and a clear confirmation to the effect that matching provision exists in the State budget to enable quick processing in the Ministry of Tribal Affairs for release of grants. This was followed up with State Governments again at different forums.

(2) The officers from the Ministry were also deputed to visit various States/Union Territories frequently to explain various provisions of the scheme to the State Government functionaries to enable them to take optimum advantage of the scheme.

(3) It has also been approved by the Union Government that if a Member of Parliament provides matching share out of Member of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme (MPLADS) as the substitute of the State Share, then Cental Share can be released.

Pendency in cases due to lack of funds

*483. SHRI K.KALAVENKATA RAO: Will the Minister of LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether State Governments have been blamed for pendency for cases in courts because sufficient funds were not made available by State Governments for smooth functioning of the judiciary;

(b) the ratio of High Court Judges per million of population at present;

(c) whether the Law Commission in one of its reports has recommended to increase the number of Judges per million of population; and

(d) if so, the decision of Government in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI ARUN JAITLEY): (a) Pendency of cases in courts is due to various factors. These, *inter alia*, include inadequate judge strength, non-filling up of existing vacancies of the posts of Judges and Judicial Officers, inadequate use of Information Technology in courts, increased institution of cases, etc. Expenditure on High Courts and Subordinate Courts is borne by the State Governments.

The Hon'ble Chief Justice of India in his Law Day Address on 26th November, 2001 stated "the reason why we do not have more judges across the board is because the States are simply not willing to provide the finances that are required.... Each and every State in the country has stated in reply that it has no more money for the judiciary."

(b) At present there is 0.647 judge of High Court per million population in the country.

(c) Yes, Sir.

(d) The Judge strength in Supreme Court is as per the Constitution of India. The judge strength in the High Courts is reviewed once in three years on the basis of figures of institution and disposal of cases by each High Court. As regards District and Subordinate Courts, the primary responsibility for taking necessary action for increasing the Judge strength as well as filling up of the existing vacancies vests with the State Governments. State Governments have been periodically requested to fill up vacant posts in the District and Subordinate Courts.

Clearance of Rofecoxib Gel

*485. MISS MABEL REBELLO:
SHRI MUNNAVAR HASAN:

Will the Minister of HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Rofecoxib Gel was cleared by DCGI without even checking the trial reports;

(b) whether it is also a fact that multicentric trials at eight centres were completed just in two weeks' time;

(c) whether none of the trial reports mentions date of start and completion of trial;